To: Shah, Pv[Shah.Pv@epa.gov]

From: Akerman, Gregory

Sent: Wed 4/13/2016 8:55:32 PM

Subject: RE: Glyphosate cancer for monograph 4 10 16 ga

I can do that tonight but ... to be clear...... even though the EU did not identify those tumors, I can add them into the study summaries?... u need tables for the tumors or just text? Also..it is ok for me to incorporate the PWG re-review info (similar to how it is discussed in the CARC) into the summary for your mouse study? and then discuss the change tumor numbers? Can it be text or do I need to create a new table?

From: Shah, Pv

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 4:21 PM

To: Akerman, Gregory < Akerman. Gregory@epa.gov > **Subject:** RE: Glyphosate cancer for monograph 4 10 16 ga

I thought you were adding the information from our study reports and revised accordingly. I knew about re-counting tumour which increased 1 tumour in control and haemingiosarcoma etc. Do you remember I asked two weeks ago about pathology re-review? Any way do you have time to add that? Please let me know.

Thanks

PV

P. V. Shah, Ph.D
Chief, Chemistry, Inerts and Toxicology Assessment Branch (CITAB)
Registration Division
Office of Pesticides Programs, US EPA
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460 (USA)
Phone: 703-308-1846
Fax: 703-605-0781

Fax: 703-605-0781 Shah.Pv@epa.gov

For FED EX and UPS Deliveries: One Potomac Yard (South Building), 2777 Crystal Drive (Room S-7751), Arlington, VA 22202

From: Akerman, Gregory

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 4:11 PM

To: Shah, Pv < <u>Shah.Pv@epa.gov</u>>

Subject: Glyphosate cancer for monograph 4 10 16 ga

PV- we can talk about this tomorrow. I noted where CARC identified tumor types that were not identified in your studies. For the most part things match up but of course there are studies that you have that we didn't and vice versa. You will need to make the call on whether or not to add the additional tumor types- if they were not identified in the EU reports then maybe there is a reason they were not included. For the tumors observed in the studies you reviewed, the rationale for not considering them treatment related is similar to that of EPA. I'm available to tomorrow if you want to go over this .

Greg